DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 435 684 TM 030 315

AUTHOR Vanden Berk, Eric J.; Cassata, Jennifer Coyne; Moye, Melinda J.; Yarbrough, Donald B.; Siddens, Stephanie K.

TITLE Teaching and Learning: Highlighting the Parallels between Education and Participatory Evaluation.

PUB DATE 1999-11-00

NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association (14th, Orlando, FL, November 3-6, 1999).

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Constructivism (Learning); *Educational Psychology; Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teachers; Theories

IDENTIFIERS *Participatory Evaluation; *Stakeholders

ABSTRACT

As an evaluation team trained in educational psychology and committed to participatory evaluation and its evolution, the researchers have found the parallel between evaluator-stakeholder roles in the participatory evaluation process and educator-student roles in educational psychology theory to be important. One advantage then is that the theories and processes of teaching and learning, inherent in participatory evaluation, are present in the training and everyday activities of the educator. However, the literature on participatory evaluation has neglected to take full advantage of this parallel (particularly when educators are the primary stakeholders). As evaluators working with educators, these researchers see it as part of their responsibility to ensure that this parallel is highlighted and understood. By critically examining the theories and practices of participatory evaluation and constructivism, they attempt to demonstrate how these parallels can lead to increased understanding and utilization. In addition, examples are taken from actual evaluations to discuss methods and provide recommendations for taking advantage of these parallels to improve the theory and practice of participatory evaluation in general. (Contains 1 table and 23 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 435 684

Teaching and Learning: Highlighting the Parallels between Education and Participatory Evaluation

Eric J. Vanden Berk, Jennifer Coyne Cassata, Melinda J. Moye, and Donald B. Yarbrough

The University of Iowa

Stephanie K. Siddens

Fairfax County Public Schools

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E Vandenberk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Evaluation Association

Orlando, Florida 1999

TM030315

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

We are an evaluation team trained in educational psychology, committed to participatory evaluation (PE) and its evolution. Given that our primary stakeholders are often educators, the parallel between evaluator-stakeholder roles—in the PE process—and educator-student roles—in educational psychology theory—is important. One advantage then is that the theories and processes of teaching and learning, inherent in PE, are present in the training and everyday activities of the educator. However, the PE literature has neglected to take full advantage of this parallel (particularly when educators are the primary stakeholders). Therefore, as evaluators working with educators, we see it as part of our responsibility to ensure that this parallel is highlighted and understood. By critically examining the theories and practices of both PE and constructivism, we hope to demonstrate how these parallels can lead to increased understanding and utilization. In addition, we use examples from our own evaluations to discuss methods and provide recommendations for taking advantage of these parallels to improve the theory and practice of PE in general.

Author Note

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Eric J. Vanden Berk, the College of Education, University of Iowa, N440 Lindquist Center, Iowa City, IA, 52242. Electronic mail may be sent to eric-vanden@uiowa.edu.

Teaching and Learning: Highlighting the Parallels between Education and Participatory Evaluation

How can we make the process of evaluation less threatening to educators? Evaluation of educational programs is becoming increasingly common, yet educators remain skeptical about the value and purposes of evaluation. It is important, then, that evaluators develop ways to involve educators—who are obviously key stakeholders in all educational programs—in the evaluation process to increase the likelihood of evaluation utilization (Nevo, 1994). Possible answers may lie in a connection between the theoretical worlds of education and evaluation.

In recent years, new paradigms have emerged in both evaluation and education. Two of these emerging paradigms, participatory evaluation (PE) and constructivism, have a great deal in common in terms of their assumptions about the nature of the learning process. By highlighting the parallels between these two paradigms, particularly when the primary stakeholders are educators, the evaluation process becomes more understandable and less intimidating. In turn, the potential for utilization improves. Regrettably, the potential benefits of a cognitive link between PE and constructivism have not been fully explored.

As the fields of education and evaluation have developed, both have undergone several paradigm shifts. In education, views about the nature of teaching and learning have shifted several times over the course of the 20th century. The current paradigm is "based on the latest research on cognitive developmental and constructivist theory" and is competing with an older paradigm "based on reductionist principles and behavioral theory" (Fischetti, Dittmer, & Kyle, 1996, p. 190). In evaluation, the newest paradigms are based on the view that stakeholders need to be actively involved in the decision-making processes for utilization to fully occur (Patton,

1997). These more recent stakeholder-participation approaches developed largely in response to the shortcomings of earlier experimental paradigms (Shadish, Cook, & Leviton, 1991).

Anytime people shift to a new paradigm there is a period of resistance and transition. Fischetti et al. (1996) discuss a number of obstacles that educators must overcome as they shift to current views of teaching and learning. Although presented in an educational context, many of these obstacles generalize across disciplines. The first obstacle is the natural resistance to change that people demonstrate when presented with something new. Second is the challenge of insuring that information and understanding is uniform across all levels of the system. Third, Fischetti et al. argue, is the tendency people have to get so caught up in a new paradigm that they fail to view it critically. The fourth and final obstacle is the disassociation that often occurs between classroom learning experiences and learning experiences outside the school environment.

These obstacles are paralleled in evaluation by the ever-present gap between research and practice. Evaluators interested in the utilization of evaluation findings necessarily focus on this gap. Patton (1997) argues that the quality of an evaluation depends on the extent to which the intended users use the findings. Cousins and Earl (1992) agree, asserting that an important goal for evaluators is to make their findings "accessible and important to users" (p. 399). Since educational program evaluation results can lead to curricular changes, a focus on utility is crucial. Thus, the active involvement of educators in educational program evaluation is essential. Given PE's specific emphasis on participation-based utilization, a strong argument emerges for PE based educational evaluation. In addition, by linking educators' existing conceptualizations of constructivism to PE, a transfer mechanism for improved understanding arises.

The goal of the present paper is twofold. First, by critically examining the theories and practices of both PE and constructivism, we hope to highlight their parallels. In turn, this will show that constructivism is a natural avenue to explore for improving PE theory. Second, we will discuss how helping educators transfer their knowledge about constructivist teaching practices to PE contexts can make evaluation less threatening to them and increase the utilization of evaluation information.

Participatory Evaluation

Participatory evaluation (PE) is rapidly emerging as a valuable addition to the contemporary list of utilization-focused evaluation models (Cousins and Whitmore, 1998). This approach sets itself apart from previous approaches in that it places a unique emphasis on participant involvement. The goal of PE is to enhance utilization by facilitating the primary participants' ownership of the evaluation. That is, participants are responsible for focusing the evaluation on the process and outcomes they consider important and to which they are committed (Patton, 1997). All aspects of the evaluation then become more understandable and meaningful to the participants. In turn, PE requires the evaluator to recognize and value participants' perspectives and expertise and to help them recognize the benefits of the evaluation process.

It is through the actual process of evaluation that program participants develop ownership of the decisions and gain empowerment. Participant involvement throughout the evaluation process also allows the participants to learn the logic of evaluation (Patton, 1997). For this reason, the PE model is firmly oriented toward principles and process rather than methodology. This emphasis presents a challenge to evaluators because, to a large extent, process is dependent on local context. Thus, there is no single best way or "blueprint" for conducting PE (Burke, 1998).

PE Principles and Process

What principles and practices facilitate successful PE? From the growing body of PE research, program evaluators have recently begun to establish a set of guiding principles (Burke, 1998; Patton, 1997; Worthen et al., 1997). A general list includes: participant ownership and involvement in the evaluation process, recognition and respect for all participants' values and experiences, evaluator facilitated collaboration among participants in order to generate a collective knowledge base, shared status and decision making power among evaluator and participants, and shared accountability among evaluator and participants through continual critical self-examination. In addition, Patton (1997) believes that PE should focus on the evaluation outcomes participants consider important. In turn, all aspects of the evaluation, including data, should be meaningful to participants. Finally, Burke (1998) also includes the importance of context-specific evaluation and the promotion of empowerment to those having the least power in the context of the evaluation.

Principles must naturally be embedded in the process. Burke (1998) has been instrumental in identifying several essential elements in the PE process. The process must: ensure that primary stakeholders are actively involved in decision making, be sensitive to the inequalities among the participating stakeholders, recognize that all program evaluation activity is socially organized and political, incorporate mixed-methods of data collection, provide an educational experience for all participants, and provide a design that facilitates long-term decision making and goals.

Organizational Learning

Principles and process are not enough for successful PE; it also requires solid grounding in theory. However, theory tends to be the weakest component of program evaluation. Efforts to strengthen the theoretical justification for PE are just beginning to emerge. Through the

incorporation of organizational learning (OL) theory, Cousins and Earl (1992) have provided the most comprehensive theoretical support for PE to date.

The fundamental assumption of OL is that knowledge is socially constructed. The weight given to new information depends upon the value the individual places on its source. The type of learning considered important in an OL system is that which integrates new constructs into existing cognitive structures (Cousins & Earl, 1992). OL is measured by the extent to which the organization is improved through better understanding. As cognitive schema and socially constructed knowledge become increasingly shared among organization members, OL theory dictates that understanding will be enhanced.

Given that enhanced utilization is the ultimate goal of PE, it is clear that OL theory has a strong capacity to link participant understanding to utilization of evaluation results. Through the promotion of such a learning system, better-informed decisions are expected. Thus, the extent to which PE can improve educational organizations depends in part on the ability of the evaluator to initiate and maintain an OL system.

As with paradigm shifts, new approaches require an adjustment in thinking on part of both the organization and the evaluator. Cousins and Earl (1992) list five organizational-specific requirements and six evaluator-specific requirements necessary for PE to become feasible. Organizational-specific requirements include:

> 1) The evaluation must be valued by the organization.
> 2) The organization must provide the time and resources required.
> 3) Organizations need to be committed to organizational learning as a route toward improvement.
> 4) Primary users participating in evaluation activities must be motivated to do so.
> 5) It is necessary to assume that organization members likely to participate in evaluation do not have sufficient research experience and knowledge to carry out the task but that they have the ability to learn given appropriate training (pp. 412-413).

Evaluator-specific requirements include:

1) The evaluator must have the necessary training and expertise concerning technical research skills.
2) Evaluators are accessible to organizations for participatory activities.
3) Resources necessary to the research process must be available.
4) Evaluators need to adapt a pedagogical role in the participatory process.
5) Evaluators must be motivated to participate.
6) Evaluators ought to have significant tolerance for imperfection (pp. 413-414).

Constructivism: A New Approach to PE with Educators

Just as Cousins and Earl (1992) suggest that incorporating OL theory, and its assumption that knowledge is socially constructed, could enhance PE, there has been a recent movement within education toward constructivism or learner-centered instruction, or the view that students are active in the construction of knowledge. Constructivism developed in response to earlier theories of learning, such as behaviorism and information-processing theories of learning (Schunk, 1996). Constructivism is built on the underlying assumption that students are active learners and construct knowledge and understanding for themselves and through social interactions (Bredo, 1997). However, constructivism does not represent a singular perspective, rather it has various forms depending on the nature of the knowledge construction by the learner (Moshman, 1982).

Constructivist Perspectives

Moshman (1982) discussed three categories of constructivism: exogenous, endogenous and dialectical. Exogenous constructivism is the perspective that considers knowledge to be the reconstruction of structures that actually exist in the external world. Knowledge is better when it accurately captures this external reality via mechanisms such as schema and mental models. Information processing theories of learning, with a focus on the individual's interpretation of the external world, are consistent with this view of constructivism.

In contrast, Moshman (1982) explains that endogenous constructivism emphasizes that learners construct their own knowledge through transforming and reorganizing their existing cognitive structures rather than directly from external information. Piaget's cognitive theory of development, with its focus on the cognitive structures that children develop, is a good example of this perspective (Schunk, 1996).

Finally, Moshman (1982) discusses dialectical constructivism, or the perspective that considers knowledge to develop through interactions between people and the environment. Rather than a representation of the external world or solely the working of internal cognitive structures, knowledge results from the outcomes of coordinating the external and the internal. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory of development is a good example of the dialectical constructivist perspective because it focuses on the child's internalization of language and other cultural tools (Schunk, 1996).

Roles of Teacher and Learner

All three perspectives of constructivism have played a role in educational practice in recent history, but the perspective of dialectical constructivism most closely relates to current efforts to develop learner-centered instruction in which learning is viewed as a collaboration among students and teacher (Marshall, 1992). Just as PE requires collaboration between evaluator and stakeholder, constructivist teaching practices involve collaboration between teacher and students. In particular, Vygotsky's theories have been extremely influential in education, especially concepts such as scaffolding and the zone of proximal development (Bredo, 1997; Vygotsky, 1978).

As a result, teachers working in the constructivist paradigm serve as facilitators and guides, rather than as conveyors of information. Students, then, actively construct knowledge through

the interpretation of their experiences both individually in the environment as well as with fellow students and teachers (Marshall, 1992). In constructivist educational approaches, students are an important part of not only their own learning, but also in the learning of their classmates. Since knowledge is viewed as socially constructed, peers play a crucial role in learning and development (Bredo, 1997; Schunk, 1987).

Implications for Instruction

It is quite easy to see that constructivist theories have many implications for instruction. Instruction based on constructivist principles must emphasize interaction and application, which help students construct meaning for themselves (Paris, Cross, & Lipton, 1984). As discussed above, teachers working within a constructivist perspective provide coaching or support for students as they work in their zones of proximal development, or the area just above a student's current capability where they can succeed with assistance (Collins, Brown, & Newman, 1989; Wertsch, 1991). Brooks and Brooks (1993) developed a list of constructivist practices teachers could use in their classrooms. Among other things, they encourage teachers to support student autonomy, allow student responses to drive lessons, encourage students to engage in dialogue, encourage student inquiry, seek elaboration of initial student responses, engage students in experiences that bring about disequilibrium, and provide time for students to discover relationships and create metaphors.

On a more theoretical level, theories of constructivism have implications for education as well. The American Psychological Association (APA), in conjunction with the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory (McREL; 1993) developed a set of 12 learner-centered principles to help educators understand and facilitate student learning (Alexander & Murphy, 1998). While designed as a complementary set, the principles are divided into categories:

metacognitive and cognitive factors, affective factors, developmental factors, personal and social factors, and individual differences (McREL, 1993). These principles provide a useful tool for educators as they design and implement instructional practices.

It becomes quickly apparent that the implications of constructivism for instruction have parallels in the implications OL-theory has for PE. First, the role of the teacher in constructivism parallels the role of the evaluator in PE. Correspondingly, the role of the student parallels that of the stakeholder. Thus, when educators are stakeholders in an evaluation, their role parallels that of the students in their own classrooms. It becomes the responsibility of the PE-driven evaluator to help the educator understand how his/her role in the evaluation is much like the role of the student in a constructivist classroom. In order to facilitate this understanding evaluators need tools to help them. In the following section of the paper, we discuss ways in which evaluators can implement OL systems within educational organizations, by using constructivist principles as a tool to help educators understand the theories and goals of PE.

Transfer: Linking Constructivism to PE

Providing a theoretical framework that links assessment practice to learning theory is an important and emerging challenge for educational program evaluators. Our goal is to provide some direction toward a framework that integrates constructivist theories and PE. Recent literature on cognitive learning theory suggests that the understanding of such linkage mechanisms—known as transfer—is fundamental to understanding the quality of learning experiences and to how meaningful competencies are acquired (Bransford et al., 1999).

Specifically, transfer refers to our capacity to extend what we understand in one context to new contexts (Byrnes, 1996). Naturally then, transfer requires an initial learning phase followed by an opportunity for learning in another context—the transfer context. The occurrence and

magnitude of transfer depends largely on the match between the elements across the two learning contexts. However, even when elements across two contexts appear to be highly similar, transfer is not guaranteed. The promotion of flexible thinking is central to the activation and enhancement of transfer (Bransford et al., 1999). This can be accomplished by providing the learner with additional examples, engaging the learner in "what-if" problem solving tasks, and asking the learner to generalize the specific case in such a way that a solution is created that can be applied to a whole class of related problems.

In the present paper, we are using the parallels between the theories involved in PE and in constructivism as an analogy to facilitate the transfer of the knowledge educators have about the learning process with their students to the evaluation context. Analogies are powerful tools for promoting transfer because, in recognizing an analogy, individuals become aware of the similarities between the initial (or familiar) situation and the transfer situation (Schunk, 1996). In the present case, the "what if" problem solving task becomes one in which the teachers are asked, "what if, during these evaluation activities, you consider your role to be like that of the students in your classroom?" The problem of what they are supposed to do in an evaluation thus becomes one that they can understand and subsequently solve.

It is incumbent upon evaluators who work with educators to highlight parallels or analogies between the educators' experience and the process of evaluation. Since evaluators often lack the necessary tools to facilitate this process, we have developed a table that summarizes the parallels we have discussed in this paper (see Table 1). In this table, important characteristics of PE and constructivist approaches in education are directly compared across a variety of contexts: assumptions about knowledge, guiding principles, assumptions and requirements for instruction/evaluation process, role of teacher/evaluator, role of students/ stakeholders, and goals.

Our hope is that this table can serve as a tool for evaluators to use with educator stakeholders to facilitate the transfer process. Evaluators could work through this table with educators and help them understand the parallels between what happens in their classrooms and what happens in PE. In addition, we hope that this table can serve as a template for other comparative tables or tools for evaluators to use with stakeholders both inside and outside of education.

We conclude this paper with a discussion of some illustrative cases from our own experience as team members working in the Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA). CEA evaluations typically involve educators as stakeholders, however, we do believe that lessons from these cases can generalize to all PE-focused program evaluations.

Case Studies

We present two brief cases as examples of successful implementation of the constructivist educational approach to evaluation work with teachers and school personnel. In the first, a group of teachers in a middle school project (in collaboration with an outside evaluator) served as sources of questions, interview designers, interviewees, and as quality controllers. Once evaluation information had been collected, they were responsible for problem definition, brainstorming solutions, and evaluating and implementing solutions to the defined problems. In the second case example, teachers became part of a situated learning community taking on more and more responsibility for the evaluation from the outside evaluator. By the end of the year, they had assumed primary responsibility for the instrumental uses of the evaluation information and for reporting results to the school board.

Case Example One: Description

A mid-sized school district in the Midwest planned to transition its junior high schools to middle schools over a one-year period. The middle school concept called for teams of teachers

from all subject areas to collaborate in teaching intact cohorts of approximately 160 students. In addition, the teacher teams were expected to be responsible for monitoring and discussing student progress, dealing with motivational and discipline problems, and meeting with and enlisting the on-going support of parents in the joint educational enterprise. Teachers and administrators expected to experience numerous problems in the transition, and wanted an external evaluator to design and implement the formative evaluation so that problems could be identified and solved quickly. The goal of the evaluation was to uncover problems as they arose and produce and implement good solutions before the transition was threatened.

The outside evaluator (CEA staff member) enlisted the aid of the teachers in the transition schools to devise a set of questions sufficient to address all areas where they might experience problems. Together, they developed a sequence of telephone interviews spread over the first two to six weeks of the transition. Immediately after the interview, the evaluation staff produced transcripts of the interviews and returned them to the teachers. Teachers were responsible for identifying and defining the problems in the transition by sharing the transcripts with one another, constructing their joint version of reality, "correcting" and adding information to the transcripts and returning them to the evaluator. In this model, teachers assumed all responsibility for identifying the most important problems and their causes. The evaluator, a seasoned observer of schools and similar organizations, asked probing questions, helped clarify the constructs, helped teachers discuss their opinions with one another, presented conflicting opinions in neutral fashion, and maintained the focus and the case data sets. Six weeks into the transition, the evaluator had collected sufficient information to design and coordinate a Saturday workshop for teachers and administrators. Using compilations and summaries collected orally from teachers, and condensed, organized and summarized by the evaluator into narratives and tables, teams of

teachers, administrators, and other involved school staff revisited teachers' problem diagnoses and definitions. Once they had arrived at clear problem statements, they brainstormed possible solutions, evaluated the solutions for feasibility, efficiency, and efficacy, discussed available resources, and prepared implementation plans where possible. Teachers assumed responsibility for monitoring the solution plans with the assistance of the district evaluation office and the building administrators.

Case Example One: Analysis

The knowledge in this evaluation was socially constructed at all important stages. At the beginning, the evaluator and the teachers worked to design the interview format and questions. During the ensuing interview collection phase, the evaluator collaborated with the individual teachers to explore the nature of the problems. As needed, the evaluator was able to adjust subsequent interviews as theories about the nature of problems emerged. Once interviews were collected, they were shared with teachers immediately, before any analysis, so that they could begin thinking about the information and contribute analyses and interpretations. Conflicts and differences of opinion were dealt with in the developing community construction of the nature of possible problems and their solutions. The evaluator served as a facilitator and as a collaborator, but not as an expert on the set of problems and their solutions that were emerging.

Reporting and information sharing took place at all times, culminating in the workshop. During the interactive group meetings, school teachers, administrators and other staff had the opportunity to redefine problems and pose solutions in the communities that were responsible for dealing with the problems. Because the administrative styles in the district were changing as part of the middle school transition, the workshop served as a model for collaborative learning and decision-making as the new organizations learned how to improve themselves.

Case Example Two: Description

In collaboration with a business community leader, school district facilitators, and a school counselor, teachers in a moderately-sized school district in a large urban area received funding to start a "business career academy" within an existing high school. The group requested and enlisted the support of an external evaluator to "conduct the evaluation" as requested by the school board for purposes of accountability. The evaluator, a CEA staff member, developed a set of activities to reveal the skills that the design and implementation team could bring to bear on the evaluation. She repeatedly engaged the teachers in discussions about what the evaluation should accomplish and how. They discussed the evaluation and implementation plan in regular meetings and via a list-serve and e-mail. Over time the group of teachers, gradually growing to view themselves as an evaluation team, began to discuss what they wanted to accomplish with the evaluation report. The external evaluator set a date approximately at the time of the Year One report to the school board when she would no longer be available to the team of teachers (by this point, the teachers had taken charge and the school district facilitators were only tangentially involved). While the evaluator, as the team member most skilled in data analysis, continued to provide the summaries of the team's evaluation instruments and to help with technical data collection and analysis issues, the teachers were fully responsible for constructing the most important meanings from data. The team assumed responsibility for designing, preparing and presenting the final report. Most importantly, they made improvements in the program in an on-going way, without having to wait for evaluator reports. They planned to include students more thoroughly in the continued evaluation of the business career academy during Year Two, and expressed satisfaction with their ability to conduct both formative and summative evaluations of the business career academy.

Case Example Two: Analysis

Case Two shares many features with Case One. In the beginning, the teachers were providing information for use in developing the evaluation but did not yet view themselves as equally responsible. By the end of the process, the teachers were equal collaborators in the evaluation, taking on the primary responsibility for utilization of evaluation information and for summative reporting to external audiences. The evaluator's role was to guide the situated learning, to provide technical expertise and support, and gradually to relinquish expertise to the group. The teachers assumed progressively more demanding responsibilities as their knowledge grew.

In Case Two, teachers were not only constructing knowledge about their specific program. Much of the teachers' learning was about how to conduct and use evaluations in ways that were useful for them and the audience members that they deemed most important (e.g., the school board, funding sources). In addition, the evaluator and the teachers were all learning about how meaning was constructed in this particular situated group.

In subsequent interviews about their perspectives on the evaluation, the teachers reported that their work as an evaluation team had led to much quicker instrumental improvements, greater understanding of the strengths and weaknesses in the business academy, and greater skill in and ownership of the responsibility for evaluation. They planned continued evaluation of the business academy during Year Two, and expressed satisfaction with their ability to conduct both formative and summative evaluations of the business academy. They also seemed to have changed subtly in their constructions of the role of their students in the evaluation. Originally, they saw students as providing evaluation information about the program as well as about them, the teachers. However, in discussing the next year's evaluation, they clearly were starting to think of the students as co-collaborators in the program and its evaluation. They expressed the

need to get more feedback from students and to discus with them in more detail about their roles in and possible contributions to the evaluation.

Summary

Both of these cases involved the incorporation of constructivist ideas about learning into evaluation activities. In each, the success of the evaluation hinged on a transition in participants' understanding of the role of the evaluator. Typically, educators view evaluators as experts who are responsible for determining their effectiveness. In these cases, PE began to occur once the educators came to view themselves as collaborators with the evaluators, rather than as the objects of evaluation. This transition was facilitated by the evaluators' abilities to understand the educators' perspectives about teaching and learning.

In these cases, we did not specifically set out to highlight the parallels between constructivism and PE. We anticipate that this is an avenue we will pursue in the future. It is our hope that other evaluators will also pursue this and related avenues for strengthening the theoretical background of PE. In short, we agree with Burke's (1998) assertion that, in order for PE to evolve, it is important for evaluators to share the successes and failures of their respective evaluations as well as the theoretical frameworks behind them.

References

Alexander, P.A., & Murphy, P.K. (1998). The research base for APA's learner-centered psychological principles. In N.M. Lambert & B.L. McCombs (Eds.), How students learn: Reforming schools through learner-centered education (pp. 25-60). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Bransford, J. D.; Brown, A. L.; and Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (1999). How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School. Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning, Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press

Bredo, E. (1997). The social construction of learning. In G.D. Phye (Ed.), Handbook of academic learning: Construction of knowledge (pp. 3-45). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Brooks, J.G., & Brooks, M.G. (1993). Becoming a constructivist teacher. In ASCD (Ed.), In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Burke, B. (1998). Evaluating for a Change: Reflections on Participatory Methodology. In Whitmore, E. (Ed.), Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, no. 80, American Evaluation Association, pp. 43-56. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Byrnes, J. P. (1996). Cognitive Development and Learning in Instructional Contexts. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Collins, A., Brown, J.S., & Newman, S.E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L.B. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cousins J. B. and Earl, L. M. (1992). The Case for Participatory Evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14(4), 397-418.

Cousins J. B. and Whitmore E. (1998). Framing Participatory Evaluation. In Whitmore, E. (Ed.), Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, no. 80, American Evaluation Association, pp. 5-23. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fischetti, J., Dittmer, A., & Kyle, D.W. (1996). Shifting paradigms: Emerging issues for educational policy and practice. Teacher Educator, 31, 189-201.

Marshall, H.H. (1982). Redefining student learning: Roots of educational change. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Moshman, D. (1982). Exogenous, endogenous, and dialectical constructivism. Developmental Review, 2, 371-384.

Nevo, D. (1994). Combining internal and external evaluation: A case for school-based evaluation. Studies in Educational Evaluation, 20, 87-98.

Paris, S., Cross, D., & Lipson, M. (1984). Informed strategies for learning: A program to improve children's reading awareness and comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 1239-1252.

Patton, M. Q. (1997). Utilization-Focused Evaluation. (3rd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schunk, D.H. (1987). Peer models and children's behavioral change. Review of Educational Research, 57, 149-174.

Schunk, D.H. (1996). Learning theories: An educational perspective (2nd Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shadish, W.R., Cook, T.D., & Leviton, L.C. (1991). Foundations of program evaluation: Theories of practice. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. In J. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scriber, and E. Souberman, (Eds. and Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Whitmore, E. (Ed.). (1998). Understanding and Practicing Participatory Evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, no. 80, American Evaluation Association, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Woolfolk, A.E. (1998). Educational Psychology (7th Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Worthen, B. R.; Sanders J. R.; and Fitzpatrick, J. L. (1997) Program Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines. (2nd Ed.) White Plains, NY: Longman.

Table 1 – Participatory Evaluation and Constructivism Linkage Tool

	Participatory Evaluation	Constructivism
Assumptions about knowledge	1. OL theory states that knowledge is socially constructed	1. Knowledge is socially constructed
	2. Collaboration among participants generates a collective knowledge base.	2. Knowledge is built on what students and teachers contribute and construct together
Guiding principles	1. Participant ownership and involvement is essential.	1. Students drive instruction.
	2. Evaluator recognizes the values and experiences of all participants.	2. Teacher values the potential and contributions of all learners.
	3. Decision-making power is shared between evaluator and participants.	3. Questions and decisions are developed through the collaboration of teacher and students.
	4. Accountability is shared between evaluator and participants.	4. Responsibility for learning is shared between teacher and students.
	5. Evaluation is socially organized and political.	5. Learning is socially organized.
Assumptions and requirements for instruction/evaluation process	1. Evaluation must be valued by organization.	1. Learning must be valued by students.
	2. Stakeholders must be motivated to participate.	2. Teachers and students must be motivated.
	3. Focus on process of evaluation as learning experience for both evaluator and stakeholders.	3. Focus on co-construction of knowledge with students.
Role of evaluator/ Role of teacher	1. Facilitator	1. Facilitator
	2. Collaborator	2. Guide or coach
	3. Learning resource – adopt pedagogical role	3. Co-participant in learning process
Role of stakeholders/ Role of students	1. Decision-makers	1. Active thinkers
	2. Evaluators	2. Active social participants
Goals	1. Focus of evaluation is on making findings accessible to increase utilization by stakeholders.	1. Focus of teaching is on understanding and comprehension.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE